



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/866,205 05/25/2001		Shea Chen	004578.1123	4344
75	590 07/07/2003			
Jerry W. Mills, Esq. Baker Botts L.L.P. Suite 600			EXAMINER	
			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/866,205	CHEN & PILLANS & EHMKE & YAO
7. 	Examiner	Art Unit
	Renee S. Luebke	2833
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this a (1) a timely filed amendmen	application. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fort than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS C	date of the final rejection. F THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exte 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorten (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount ed statutory period for reply originally	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	ther consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding numbe	er of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted i	n a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request to application in condition for allowance because: §		considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S :	
Claim(s) allowed: 10,20 and 25-36.		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>37 and 38</u>		
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,6-9,11,14-16,18,19 and 21	•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ d	isapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No	o(s)
10. ✓ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		
		Renee S. Luebke Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2833

Continuation of 5. (does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:) applicant's arguments are not convincing. As pointed out in the previous rejection, each outer portion of the Randall membrane has an upper area that is "free of physical coupling to the base" as claimed; the lower area of the outer portion is coupled to the base.

Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the rejection is not based solely on Randall. As previously stated, the rejection is based on Applicant's indicated "existing" type of switch as discussed in the application. The comparison in the previous Office action to Goldsmith and the prior art shown by Randall is solely to show that applicant's "existing" device IS old and IS "prior art" as challenged (but not supported) by Applicant. In other words, the basis of the rejection did not change from the first Office action to the second Office action, except to include explanation based on the amendments to the claims.

Continuation of 10. Other: The formal drawings (sheets 3 and 5) are approved by the Examiner..